

## **REMARKS**

The Specification has been amended. Claims 1, 14, 20 - 21, and 25 have been amended. Claims 26 - 34 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claims 2 - 13, 17, and 19 were previously cancelled from the application without prejudice. Claims 1, 14 - 16, 18, and 20 - 34 are now in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, and claim amendments and cancellations in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

### **I. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §112, first paragraph**

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated October 21, 2010 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U. S. C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, paragraph 4 of the Office Action discusses the term “... operates independently of the electronic calendar ...”. This term has been replaced herein with “... is distinct from the electronic calendar ...”. Applicants respectfully submit that this current claim language addresses the concerns raised in paragraphs 3 - 4 of the Office Action, and the

Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §112 rejection.

II. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §103(a)

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that Claims 1, 14 - 16, 18, and 20 - 25 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Publication 2004/0043758 to Sorvari et al. (hereinafter, “Sorvari”) in view of U. S. Patent 6,731,393 to Currans et al. (hereinafter, “Currans”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, MPEP §2143.03 – which is titled “All Claim Limitations Must Be Considered” (and which is found within Section MPEP §2143, titled “Examples of Basic Requirements of a *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness”) – quotes *In re Wilson*, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970), which held that “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Sorvari nor Currans, nor any combination thereof (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of skill in the art was motivated to attempt it), teaches or suggests all words of the claim recitations of their independent Claims 1, 20, and 21 as currently recited, as will now be demonstrated.

Referring first to independent Claim 1, paragraph 14 of the Office Action admits that Sorvari “does not specifically [disclose]” the “and scheduling time on an electronic calendar of the user” claim language which is recited in the final claim element of Claim 1. Paragraph 15 of the

Office Action then states that this claim language is taught by Currans, referring in particular to col. 12, line 58 - col. 13, line 52 and **Figs. 6 - 8** of Currans.

Applicants have amended the final claim element of Claim 1 herein, adding the word “also” on line 20 to emphasize that 2 things are done in the “if so” clause – namely, “automatically sending ...” and also “scheduling ...”. The scheduling claim language has been clarified to recite scheduling “an interval of time” on an electronic calendar. See, for example, Applicants’ **Fig. 7**, where reference number **720** illustrates, by way of example, how a user can select an interval of time **721** to be scheduled on the user’s electronic calendar when a match is detected. See also paragraphs **[0057] - [0061]** of Applicants’ application as published, which discuss this scenario.

Applicants respectfully submit that this “scheduling an interval of time on an electronic calendar of the user” claim language as recited in Claim 1 is not taught by Sorvari or Currans. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by a combination of Sorvari and Currans (assuming, *arguendo*, that such combination could be made and that one of ordinary skill in the art was motivated to attempt it), when considering all the words of Claim 1 as required by the above-quoted MPEP §2143.03. Claim 1 is therefore deemed patentable, as currently presented, over the cited references. Dependent Claims 14 - 16, 18, and 22 - 25 (as well as added Claims 26 - 27) are therefore deemed patentable at least by virtue of the patentability of Claim 1 from which they depend.

Referring next to independent Claims 20 and 21, these claims are not separately analyzed in

the Office Action, and are rejected using the same analysis presented with regard to Claim 1. Office Action, paragraph 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments presented above with regard to Claim 1 apply equally to demonstrate that independent Claims 20 and 21 are patentable over the references. Added dependent Claims 28 - 34 are therefore deemed patentable at least by virtue of the patentability of Claims 20 and 21 from which they depend.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

### III. Added Claims 26 - 34

Dependent Claims 26 - 34 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. These claims are deemed patentable at least by virtue of the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend.

### IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all currently-presented claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Cust. Nbr. for Corr.: 43168  
Phone: 407-343-7586  
Fax: 407-343-7587

Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999